

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figure 14, labeling that figure as Prior Art. A replacement sheet and an annotated sheet are submitted herewith.

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending and have been amended. Figure 14 has been labeled Prior Art as required in the Office Action. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

A new Abstract has been submitted to replace the one on file. The Abstract no longer includes reference numerals and is less than 150 words long. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 2-11, 13-22 and 24-33 were objected to due to a perceived informality. The amendments to the claims are believed to overcome the objections without narrowing the scope of the claims. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a program *per se*. As shown above, claim 23 has been amended, in the manner suggested in the Office Action, to recite that the program resides on a computer recording medium. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11-13, 17, 22-24, 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA). Claims 5, 14, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over AAPA in view of Burtnyk (U.S. Patent 5,471,541). Claims 5, 16 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over AAPA in view of Yang (U.S. Patent 6,580,810). Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, image positional relationship detection means for detecting, for each sub region, having a predetermined size, of the comparison image, a positional relationship between the input image and the comparison image generated by said comparison image generation means. For example, the image positional relationship detecting means, in one illustrative embodiment, detects the image displacement distribution of each sub region of the comparison image with respect to the input image.

The recited limitation is neither taught nor suggested in the AAPA. That is, the AAPA does not detect, for each sub region of the comparison image, a positional relationship between the

input image and the comparison image. The Office Action attempted to read the recited sub region on the entire “target object” of the AAPA. Amended claim 1 makes it even more clear that the sub region is a sub region of the comparison image, and is not the entire target image. For at least the foregoing reason, amended claim 1 is believed patentable over the AAPA.

The other independent claims are believed patentable for substantially similar reasons. The dependent claims are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 24, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa
Joseph W. Ragusa
Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1633 Broadway
New York, New York 10019-6708
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant